

### **REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to correct an informality. Claims 13-15 and 19 have been amended more clearly define all the terms of the claims. Claim 19 has been further amended to correct an informality. The Specification has also been amended to correct an informality. Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested, and Claims 1-26 are pending.

#### **Statement of Substance of Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of granting telephone interviews on June 22 and 29, 2009. During the interviews Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the enablement rejections and potential amendments to overcome the rejections.

#### **Response to Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 19 are objected to because of informalities.

As noted, Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to correct informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Response to Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of co-pending Application No. 11/908,462.

Since the above rejection is provisional, Applicants elect to defer addressing the merits of these provisional rejections.

In addition, in accordance with MPEP 804(I)(B)(1), Applicants respectfully request that if the present provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the present application, which is the earlier filed of the two pending

applications, the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn and the present application be issued as a patent without a terminal disclaimer.

**Response to Claim Rejections Under § 112**

A. Claims 13, 15, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Without commenting on the merits of the rejection, Claims 13, 15, 16 and 19 have been amended to more clearly defined each term of the claims, thereby complying all of the requirements of § 112. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

(1) Regarding claims 1-12 and 26, Applicants respectfully traverse that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 1-12 and 26. As disclosed at paragraph [0039] of the specification, an Si-N bond exists in the polymer produced by using the presently claimed polymerization initiator, but it is rapidly hydrolyzed after polymerization stops. As such, it is possible to easily reproduce such a bond as an active amino group. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art can obtain the polymer of the formula (1), wherein  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$  and  $Y^1$  are a hydrogen and  $Z^1$  is an alkali metal, from the polymer of the formula (I), wherein  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$  and  $Y^1$  are a substituted silyl group and  $Z^1$  is an alkali metal, by removing the substituted silyl group.

Thus, Claims 1-12 and 26 comply with § 112, and withdrawal of that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 1-12 and 26 is respectfully requested.

(2) Regarding claims 13-16, without commenting on the merits of that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 13-16, Claims 13-15 have been amended to more clearly define

each of the terms of the claims, thereby complying with all of the requirements of § 112.

Accordingly, withdrawal of that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 13-16 is respectfully requested.

(3) Regarding claims 17-25, without commenting on the merits of that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 17-25, Claims 13-15 and 19, on which Claims 17, 18 and 20-25 read, have been amended to more clearly define each of the terms of the claims, thereby meeting all of the requirements of § 112. Accordingly, withdrawal of that part of the rejection pertaining to Claims 17-25 is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Hunter  
Registration No. 64,676

Date: August 19, 2009